

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on March 15, 2004. Claims 1-21 are rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 15 and 21 have been amended. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, 14-15 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sarkar (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,067, hereinafter "Sarkar"). Claims 3-5, 9, 12-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkar in view of Kingberg, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,887, hereinafter "Kingberg"). As discussed below, the pending claims are patentable over the above reference.

Sarkar discloses a system for the retrieval, construction and manipulation of objects using SQL over disparate relational storage systems on the web. Sarkar uses URLs to locate objects corresponding to component relational databases on the web. URLs locating relational schema components are stored as attribute values in tables. Object methods and operators on these web objects are defined as part of user defined type definition for an attribute type in a table. Object request brokers apply the methods or operators on web objects on the web.

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Sarkar does not teach or suggest a logical structure whose components include a set of questions to be presented to a user. Accordingly, Sarkar lacks the features of the present invention that are included in the following language of claim 1:

... loading a definition associated with a logical structure;  
associating components of the logical structure to an intermediate unit, the  
components of the logical structure comprising a set of questions to be presented to a  
user;

based at least in part on the loaded definition, executing the logical structure to determine a presentation sequence of the components associated to the intermediate unit; and

generating a file, which represents the presentation sequence of the components, to transmit across a network to allow presentation of the components as part of a user interface on a client terminal

Similar language is also included in independent claims 11 and 15. Thus, the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 11 and 15, and their corresponding dependent claims, is not anticipated by Sarkar.

With respect to Kingberg, it discloses a method and apparatus for logical data access to a physical relational database. Similarly to Sarkar, Kingberg does not teach or suggest a logical structure whose components include a set of questions to be presented to a user. Hence, Kingberg lacks the same features that are missing from Sarkar. Consequently, Sarkar and Kingberg, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 11 and 15, and, therefore, the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 11 and 15, and their corresponding dependent claims, is patentable over the above references.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a). Applicants furthermore submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

**Deposit Account Authorization**

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR  
& ZAFMAN LLP



---

Marina Portnova  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,750

Dated: June 14, 2004

Customer No. 008791  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300